

*R. W. D.*  
*Printed at the Press of J. M. Smith, No. 172, Cornhill, N. H.*  
**MANV MISSION  
ON TO A MANV  
DVCTION.**

**OR ANSWER TO A LETTER INFERRING  
PUB-  
lique communion in the parish assemblies upon private  
and godly persons there.**

*Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free.*

*Gal. 5. 1.*

*Be not partaker of other mens sinne*

*keep thy self pure. 1. Tim. 5. 22.*

**By John Robinson.**



**Anno Domini 1652**

*653.243*



**A**lbeit I be justly sorry for all oppositions against the truth, yet not so for this occasion of further manifesting that my formerly professed perswasion, that publique communion with the parish assemblies cannot be inferred vpon private with godly persons though members there: the constitution and estate of the same assemblies reaching up a parish wall, neither so transparent as may be seen through much lasse so open as may be poss'd, nor in the best church, as this may inducement suppoeth: but on the contrary, so grosse, & entyre in evill, as that no engine of wit, or art can so batter it, as to make a safe passage through it for a good conscience.

Needfull it were in a matter of this nature, and weight, that the manuducent, or handleader should guide men by the playn, and open way of the scriptures, as is the way of the Lord in them layd down open, & playn, as the Kings high way, and beaten by the feet of the Apostollicall churches: & not by subtilie Quarres, and doubtfull Suppositions, and such underhand conveyances, as may lead the way into a maze, and there loose him, but cannot clear the way for an vpright conscience. Of the way of Christ it was prophesied of old: *An high way shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness: the wicked shall not passe over it, for he shall be with these: the wayfaring man, though foolish, shall not erre therein.* But so many and doubtfull are the wyndeings of this mans way, as that he who findes it, had need be no wayfaring man, but a town-dweller, and well acquainted with all the secret turnings thereof: nor a fool, as the Prophet speaketh, but one haveing wit indeed more then a good deal. But let them *in whose hearts are the high wayes of the Lord, that they may get strength to strength, till they appear unto God in Zion,* let them, I say, not suffer themselves to be led by the turnings of mans devile whatsoever, but by the wordes of the wisdom of God, which are all in righteousness, & in which there is nothing wreathed, or perverse: but they are all playne to him that will understand, and straight to him that would sende knowledg.

Now for my perswasion about publique, and private communion, it is the same which I have manifested in my other book: and that, wherein (so far as by the weak light, which God hath given to shine in my heart, I can discern) I neither wrong the good in that Church, (person, or thing), nor partake in the evill of eyther. My trust is, that God who hath given me my part (though in great infirmity) in the Prophets comfort, *with all my heart have I sought thee, will also fulfill his request vpon me, let me not wander from thy commandements.*





T was some addition of honour to \* *David's* victory over the Philistines, that he slew him with his own sword: vpon which hope, mine opposites, as it seemes, enterprize the beating down of the partition wall of our separation from the parish assemblies in theyr publique communion, government, and ministry, by the engine of mine own acknowledgment, of private communion with the persons & personall graces of many christians, though otherwise members there: vpon which acknowledgment, he therefore propoundeth certeyn *Quæres* or Demands in number seauen: the first whereof is.

\* 1 Sam. 17.  
31.

Suppose one of those many so, qualified as that in the judgement of those that can discern he is competently fit to be employed in the publique ministry, having his own heart given to that work, and the hearts of many craving his help, suppose, I say, that such a man (not syndering means for the present of a comfortable entrance into that calling) shall leaue in a publique assembly, where many like himself, and many unlike are gathered together, without any further calling for a hymne, perform the actions of prayer & prophesying, without any addition, deduction, or alteration of that which he had lawfully done in private, my demand is, whether it be not lawfull so to communicate with him in his work?

1. Quære.

I answer, that these exercises of religion not performed by this persō, by any publique calling, or authority, but onely by his personall gift, & desire to do good, are not publique or Church actions, but private, and personall: nor communion with him therein, publique, but private communion: no not though performed by him in a publique place: which no more makes the action to be of publique nature, or a Church action, which in my whole book I make (as they are) the same; then did the private chambers, where the Apostles administered the word, & sacraments to the Churches, make these theyr administrations private, or personall. Reason it self teacheth that publique actions are onely such as are performed by publique authority. See *Mr. Perkins* in *Treatise of Christian equity*, for this purpose.

Answer.

The same answer serueth for the 2. *Quære* which supposeth onely a longer continuance of tyraie in the same course by connivency of them in authority: since mere continuance in the same course (especially as an ordinate means to the same end) altereth not the nature thereof. And so this, as the former *Quære*, is besides the purpose in hand. Onely I ad, that no man can continue thus preaching in a publique place especially *seue years*, but under the cloak & appearance of a Byshops minister, though he be not such indeed.

2. Quære;  
Answ.

Ad. 1. 11.  
&c. 8. 12.  
30. 47. &c.  
7.

110 A

As

Suppose

## A Manumission

*Suppose yet the same man obtayneth a licence from the L. Byshop of the Diocese without any unlawfull condition for to continue in that his course; I ask, Whether that leav, or licence given doth pollute the actions: seeing a man may ask leav of the great Turk to preach the Gospell within his dominions?*

This Supposition conteyneth a contradiction: for the very obteyning, & receiving of the Bishops licence (which yet I think no man doth before he have received orders as they are called) is a real acknowledgment that the Byshop hath a lawfull power to graunt it, which is an unlawfull condition. *John Cluydon* a martyr of Christ was otherwise minded then this man, w<sup>h</sup> he witnessed that the Byshops licence to preach the word of God, was the true character of the beast. *i. e. Antichrist*. Neyther is there the like reason of procuring the Byshops licence to preach the gospell in his Province or Diocese, & of asking leav of the great Turk to preach in his dominions. For 1. he mincerh the matter too much, in making this obteyning of the Byshops licence to be nothing but the asking him leav, as a man may ask leav of the great Turk, that is, desire him not to hinder him. For to obteyn licence of the Bishop is to obteyn publique authority of the publique officer, and according to the publique lawes, of the church, to exercise a publique ministry. 2. The great Turk is a lawfull civill Magistrate in his Dominions, with whose civill authority it is lawfull to partake: but so is not the Byshop a lawfull Ecclesiasticall officer in his Province or Diocese, with whose spirituall jurisdiction Gods servants may communicate. And is this to lead men by the hand, to take for graunted the mayn question in controversy, to wit, that the Bishops jurisdiction in their Provinces & Diocesses is lawfull: which I have also by sundry arguments proved unlawfull, & antichristian. Surely they who suffer themselves thus to be led must be as destitute of spirituall sight, as was *Saul* of bodily, when men led him by the hand to *Damascus*. Their authority then being proved (& so confessed by this myne opposit<sup>e</sup> els where) antichristian, & so consequently one of the *signs of Babylon*; whether exercised by themselves or by others; eyther Officials in the Consistories, or ministers in the Parochiall churches, may not by Gods people be partaken with, no not in actions though otherwise lawfull, under the peyn of *Babylons* plague.

And this answer also serveth to the 4<sup>th</sup> demandaund, or Supposition of this person taking besides his licence, the form of admission called orders, of the Diocesan. And so, that which I bring pag: 15. Arg: 2. of my book, is here misapplied: I there speak of lawfull actions performed merely by the personall grace of sayth, & the Spirit in a godly man, though of infirmity remaining in an estate, & standing otherwise culpable: but here of actions, though in themselves lawfull, yet performed immediately by vertue, or vice



vice rather of that very vnlawfull state, & standing.

*Suppose after this shu being desyred, & so chosen by some assembly wherein there are many fearing God apparently, he take's a Pastorall charge of them, hauing the Bishops, & Patrons admission, but chiefly, & professedly grounding his calling vpon the peoples choyse: & that he do nothing but the same he did before, besides the administration of the Sacraments to such as are in charity, & discretion to be esteemed worthy, what hindresth from communion here?*

Ans:

Indeed if men may take liberty in disputeing first to *suppose* what themselves have a mynde vnto, and after to *suppose*, that others are also of the same mynde with them, and yet have litle reason eyther for the one or other, they may then easily conclude theyr purposes. But . 1 . I deny that an assembly gathered, & consisting of *many fearing God*, & many (which must also be supplied) without the fear of God, is a lawfull Church-assembly, haueing a right in communion, or common right, to call, & enjoy a pastour, & his pastorall administrations. 2. I deny that any doth, or can truly take a pastorall charge in the parrish assemblies. It belongs to the pastours charge not onely to teach, & minister the sacraments, but also (& that as a mayn parte, or duety thereof) to govern, and *rule the flock*; which no parochiall minister doth, or can take vpon him.

Act. 10. 17.

20 1 Thef:

5. 12 1 Tim:

5. 17.

3. The Church of England; doth acknowledge no such *calling* as is *chiefly grounded vpon the peoples choyse*: but onely that which is grounded vpon the Bishops ordination at the first, and to the ministry at large; and determinately, eyther vpon the Bishops license, or vpon the patrons presentation, Bishops institution, and Arch-deacons induction, confirmed by the publique lawes of the same Church, both ecclesiasticall, & civil. According to which publique lawes, and orders (especially submission vnto them being publicly professed and given, as is by the minister here deciphered) we are to judge of the publique ministry of the Church, & not according to the private intendiments, and vnderhand professions of particular persons. And let God, & all reasonable men judge between me & myne opposite, whether a man goeing to the publique governors of a Church, & desyring of them a publique office, or publique orders, & so receaving them according to the publique lawes of the same Church, & therewith authority to preach the word, & so preaching publicly in the same Church, whether I say such a man be not to be esteemed as called to that work by these governors; & so by consequence, whether al men pertakeing with him in that work of preaching for which he was so sent, do nor partake therein withall what in them lyeth in the authority of the sender. And for such a man (except he have publicly renounced his former calling) to pretend in secret vnto his freinds whom he dare trust, & who, he thinks, will agayn trust, & beleeeve him, ey-

## A Manumission

ther that he preacheth not by that calling, or by an other principally, is but to put on a cloak of shame, & to walk in crasines, more like in truth to a disguised famillist, then a minister of Iesus Christ. And if any ministry grounded, as this man supposeth, be to be found in any of the assemblies, I deny the same to be the ministry of the Church of England, about which our question is. And howsoever men do build much vpon the peoples acceptance of, and submission vnto theyr ministry, yet is this a very sandy foundation wherevpon to build such a weight. If they be not the lawfull ministers of those Churches before, it is theyr syn to accept of them, & submit vnto them, as such. The peoples acceptance, and submission are not causes, but consequences of the ministers calling, & duties, which they ow vnto them all theyr life long. 4. The supposition is but an imagination, that any parochiall minister doth administer the sacraments onely to such as are, in charity, & discretion, to be esteemed worthy. He is by his parochiall cure (& shew me the man whose practise is not answerable) to administer the sacrament of Baptism to all the infants born in the parish, though neyther parent can, no not in the most enlarged, if not over-stretched charity, be judged to be of the sayth, & so in the covenant of Abraham; according to which covenant Baptism is to be administered. Lastly, I would know of this man (& so of others who would bring the prebiteriall government vpon the parish assemblies without a separation) what should be done with such men of years in the parishes, as are to be esteemed vncapeable of the L: Supper. It should seeme, as the common opinion is, that such should be suspended, & so consequently (remayning obstinate & incorrigible) excommunicated. But by what law of God, or reason of man, do the Censures of the Church apperteyn vnto such, as had never right to be of the Church, nor were within Gods\* cōmūn made onely with theyr saythfull, & theyr seed? And since the Church is onely to finde them which are within, & the same saln from theyr former holines, at least, externall; how should not excommunication be greatly prophaned vpon such, as never came vnder that condition of eternall holines?

Suppose at length that he be deprived by that prelate, which formerly admitted him, for not conforming to humayne corruptions, & his people for fear of danger forsake him, if he I say now reiected by the prelate, & witnessing against his corruptions, shal without seeking any new licence fynd a place to preach the gospell in occasionally els where, why should any refusers bear him?

First this his deprivation (especially for well doing or not doing evil) by the prelates spirituall jurisdiction, shewes his spirituall bondage vnto the Antichristian Hierarchy: as doth also his forsakeing his flock when the Wolfe thus cometh, declare (by the testimony of Christ himself) of what

Spirit

2 Cor. 4. 2.

Rom: 7. 31

Heb: 13 17

Gen: 17.

1 Cor: 3.

14

Qui:

Ans

Ioh: 10.

Spirit he is. And very fading is the colour, which here he sets v<sup>o</sup> the ministers cessation from their ministry: which is the peoples forsaking them for fear of danger: whereas the contrary is most true, & that the ministers did universally, for fear of danger, forsake the people: and that in sundry places, where the people offered to suffer persecution with them at the magistrates handes. But myne answer is, that this man remayning by the prelates ordination a minister of the Church of Engl: & as he was before his institution, or licence, & so preaching by that calling, communion cannot be had with him therein, without submission vnto & vpholding of the Prelates Antichristian authority, which in that work he exerciseth.

7 Q<sup>ue</sup>:

Suppose lastly that the same man doth besides the good actions which God hath commanded, admit of some thing at mans command, which is not lawfull, yet building the church, & building faithfully in the many things of the Gospel, and as may be repenting also of what he hath done at his admission: is no communion lawfull with him in those very things, which if they were done by another after the same manner were heavenly duties? May not his fault be an humayne infirmity, vs an externall ordinance? May not some fautes of his enternace be circumstantiall per-  
sonall actions by which his calling is not abolished.

Ans:

1 Tim: 9

Numb: 16.

123.3.3.3

This Quere is in effect comprehended in the former, in whose answers it hath also been answered. But for more full satisfaction I further ad; that I may not partake in the sinne, though of humayne infirmity, & of persons otherwise godly: whether those sinns be in the work done, or in the vnlawfull calling of the doer: of which we here speak, and not of any personall, or circumstantiall action, as is in vayne insinuated. And he that breaks down the partition wall which an vnlawfull especially an antichristian calling sets vp to the Ch<sup>urch</sup>, not making conscience of partaking therewith in duties how heavenly soever in themselves, makes way for all Babylonish confusion: neither is Israel now to be blamed for communicating with Corah in the heavenly duty of burning incense to the Lord, to whom onely a lawfull outward calling was wanting: he so ministering by an Anti-mosaicall, as do the men of whom we speak, by an Anti-Christian calling. And for the ministers repenting of what he hath done at his admission, it may well be called (as truly being) a supposition, but of an impossibility, and contradiction. He cannot repent of his sin, which is his receaving authority from the Bishop to preach, but he must forsake, & renounce the same authority, as he receaved it, which if he doth in deed & truth he ceaseth to be a minister of the Church of England.

And thus it appeareth, how this Authour is far from having a good conscience by the ban I a he promitteth, as that he doth not to much as poynt out with the finger any possible way into publique communion with.

with the parrish assemblies as they stand : but rayther having framed a plot of ministry, & other devise in his study, sends men by doubtfull suppositions to seek they know not what, nor where. It remaynes we now come to his removal of the bars which I in my book set in the way: the first whereof is, that, such a parrishional minister is a branch of the prelace/ as receaving power from it/ by which it doth administer/ and therfore all communion with it to be avoyded by Gods people.

His answer is, that in proper, & accurate speech the minister, whom he formerly described, is no branch of the prelace, nor doth receive his power of ministering from any prelate.

The question is not whether the minister which he describeth, or rather *Supposeth*, be a branch of the prelace, & so minister or no: but whether the ministry of the parrish assemblies, being partes of the Diocesses, and Provinces, be such or no.

He addeth, that the power of right be (that is his supposed minister) had before ever he had to do with any prelate, which power is from God by the Church: but a power of externall legall ability to do that, which from God by the people he had formerly right to do, this he may be sayd to receive from the prelate.

He looseth himself in the labyrinth of his own devise: for even his supposed minister had to do with the prelate, both for license to preach & orders of ministry before this supposed right conveyed to him by the people, as appears in his *Que:* 3. 4. & 5 compared together. 2. None of the parrish assemblies have in theyr hands, as Churches, power of right to chuse theyr ministers, nor are the Lords free people in that case: but do, on the contrary, stand in subjection & bondage spirituall to the prelate, and patron, by whose apPOINTment they must receive them, will they, nil they. Indeed some of them do by favour, or money get *ius patronatus* into theyr handes, & so do agree amongst themselves what person they will present vnto the Bishop for theyr Clark: but this they do not as a Church, neither will, or may the Bishop so receive him from them, or apPOINT him over them, but as a patron, (which right any one profane person may have & enjoy as well as they) nor, that such a person may be ordeyned a minister in, & of that Church, according to the order Apostolicall: but that being before, or first, a minister at large of the Bishops making, and ordeyning, he may by the same episcopall authority, in way of licence, or institution conveyed, be determined to that particular parrish, according to the Popish order. So that if there were any thing in the distinction between the power of right, & of freedom, he hath the power of right, or authority by the Bishop at the first, in his ordination: & the legall ability or freedom afterwards by the patron, & prelate picketing, & apPOINTING him to his place.



place: & so the parrish, as a Church onely receaves him so appoynted by others. But the distinction is more subtile then sound: & is not a distinction without a difference, yet a division of things inseparable in this kinde. No man hath *external spirituall power of right*, to minister the holy things of God, but by a lawful calling: & no man having a lawful calling wants *external spiritual power of ability or freedom* to minister them: & of this power we speak, as being that which the Bishops as the spirituall governors of theyr Prov: & Dioc: do confer. I know a man may be restrained by violence, or other bodily impediment from the use of this spirituall freedom, but then he is restrained from the use of his power of right also. Whosoever hath the one hath the other by the same act, & whosoever hath a lawfull calling, hath both. Of his great mistakeing (upon which notwithstanding he builds the weight of his answer, both in this, & the former parte of the book) which is that the Bishops Provinciaall, & Diocesan authority & administrations are civile, & derived from the king, I shall speak hereafter.

He adds that *it cannot stand with my plea, that such a man preaching diligently, & professing that to be his myn office should in this work be a branch of the prelacy, & so is by his power received by him. For. 1. this is not any parte of the prelates power (as be as a prelate) to preach the word.* Which he also would prove by an affirmation in my book, which is (though he weaken the evidence of the truth thereof in relating it) that the prelates office/ and order is founded upon theyr usurpation of the rights/ and libertyes wherewith Christ the Lord in his word hath endowed his Church (the Elders for theyr government/ and the people for theyr liberty) for the calling of officers/ & punishing of offenders. Power therefore (sayth he) of preaching can be no parte of it.

First that which he admits in myne affirmation hath enough in it to overthrow his consequence: For if it belong to the prelates to call ministers, & that in calling them, they give them power & *authority* (though no absolute charge) to preach according to the order of that Church; then followeth it vndernably, that those ministers thus preaching do therein exercise the prelates power: & that it may be sayd of the ministers, and Bishops, as Christ sayd of his disciples & himself, that whosoever receaves them which are sent, receaves them which send them. In submitting vnto, or withdrawing from him that is sent by the king, in a work of his office, men do submit vnto, or withdraw from the king himself, & his authority; so is it in all estates, & subordinations, whether Ecclesiasticall, or civile; as every one that dimis it not in himself, may see by the light of nature.

And if vnto this be added, that, as the whole nation is divided into two provinces under the two Arch-Bishops/ and the Provinces into sundry Dioceses under the Bishops/ and they into theyr severall parrishes under the ministers thereof/ so the Arch-Bishops/ and Bishops do share out vnto the parrish

\*Book of  
ordering  
of Preists.

Mat. 10, 40.

parish prestes in thei ordination/ & other assignementes/ & parte of thei charge, to wit/ so much as concerns the ordinary service of the parish: as unto thei chancelours, commissaries, and Arch-deacons an other parte for inferiour government reseruing to it selfe the Lordship over both for the best advantage of thei own honour, and profit, it will then evidently appear, (as that the part is a branch of the whole), that the parochial ministry is a branch of the diocesan & provincially prelacy. By which ministry we are not to understand (as doth myne opposite) *the work of preaching*, or any other work whatsoever, but the office, & power executed, & used in these works. For if we will exactly weigh things in a just ballance, we must consider of these three distinct poynts in the ministry. 1. The office. 2. The power. 3. The works. The office is the very state, & function conferred vpon a man by his calling: from which office ariseth immediately power, & charge to minister, and to perform the works of that office: in the performance of which works the office is executed, and power used. And if *preaching diligently & faithfully* were the pastours *mayn office*, then should Apostles, Prophets, & Evangelists, have the same *mayn office* with pastours, for they all do that work of diligent preaching, one as well as another: besides that this work is lawfully performed by him that hath no office at all, & therefore cannot be the Pastours office *mayn*, or mean.

2ly, It followeth not because the office of the prelates is founded vpon the usurpation of the Churches rights in calling of officers, & censuring of offenders, that therefore power of preaching is no parte of thei office. Men may by thei office have power to do more then the very things vpon which thei office is founded: otherwise the parochial ministry should be very slightly founded, considering how many trifles, and superstitions the ministers have not onely power but charge also to perform. By this mans reasoning thei office should be founded vppo the wearing of a surplice, making a crosse, &c. for these they have power to do, yea not power to leav undone, by thei office.

There are among men many lawfull offices or orders, & those lawfully founded, and yet not so perfectly but that some evil actions are (through humayne frailty) done in & by them: so on the contrary is the office of prelacy vnlawfull, & vnlawfully founded, and yet not so absolutely, but that the good work of preaching may be and is performed in, and by it. Which preaching being also an inferiour work of that office, and order (which is principally set vp for government): and that wherewith the Bishops do litle trouble the Churches, it may well be excluded fro the foundation of thei office, though a work thereof: (as there are also many

*doctrines of Christian religion, besydes those which are properly called the foundations*

1 Cor: 16.  
30.  
Quæ: 1, &  
2.

## to A manuduction &c.

foundations thereof) & though a work good in it self, yet in the extent of theyr power to preach when and where they list in theyr provinces, and diocesses, exorbitant, and antichristian; & so a parte of theyr usurpation, whether of the foundation, or building, it matters not: a parte of which power they also share out vnto the ministers in theyr severall parrishes.

An other argument he brings vpo an affirmatiō in my book, (p. 29) that preaching is no natural, or necessary parte of the parochiall ministers office.

This myne assertion in the first place he reprocheth as an *intemperate speech proceeding from an impotent sickness of mynde*, which yet (sayth he) may be used agaynst my selfe.

If I were sick of any such impotency of mynde, as he in his potency of mynde pronounceth, I should surely fynde him a *physician of no value*: which brings no other medicine then a reproch to cure me withall. One ly he insinuates a reason agaynst that I say, which is, that, *preaching the word is expressly mentioned in the ministers ordination*. And is it not also mentioned in the ordination of a Mas-preist, of whose office notwithstanding it is no necessary or naturall parte? yea is it not evident that one, and the same ordination serves both for a Mas-preist, & parochiall minister, being given, by a popish Byshop? and so by consequence, that there is one, & the same office of both, though exercised in some different workes? So also is *ministering the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commaunded*, expressly mentioned in his ordination: & is it therefore a necessary work of the Parochiall minister? or is he any more then the Bishops mans man in publick thing his court censure? The Bishop also expressly bids his ordeyned ones *Receave the H: Ghost*. Doth he therefore so receave it? Or know we not that it is Antichrists guise, and that not a litle advantageable to the mystery of his iniquity, to keep the formes of good wordes without the substance of things, & so vnder the name of Christ to subvert Christs truth, and ordinances? I would to God the notorious ignorance, and utter inability to preach the gospel in the greatest parte, by farr, of the parochiall ministers, to the destruction of so many 1000 soules for which Christ dyed, did not cry out vnto God, and men agaynst both that Church, Prelacy, and ministry, that preaching is no necessary parte, or work of theyr office. There is but one order, or office of preisthood in that church: & how can that be a naturall, or necessary parte of that office, which the most of those officers want, this especially being by the constant practise of the publique governers, & according to the constitution, and state of that Church, ministry, and government; the publique lawes thereof also both ecclesiasticall, and civile approving it; as otherwise, so by appoynting homilies to be read by such as are vnable to preach.

Quare im-  
pedi.

Such a one the *patron* may present for his *Clark* to any parishonall charge, and may also compell the Bishop, will he, will he, to institute him by processe of law: whom the people also are bound to receave, as theyr minister, & with him to communicate vnder penalties civil, and spirituall. Let *Baal* then plead for himself: even the wearing of a surplice, and signing a babes forehead with the crosse are more naturall, and necessary to the parochiall ministry, considered both in the common practise, and publique lawes, then is preaching of the gospel. For inability to preach (though most ordinary) no minister is, or can be deposed: but for not conforming, how many in a few years? Myne affirmation then (how conscientiously soever myne opposite censurcth both it, & me) is so appaerly true, as it cannot be denyed without losse of credit both to the person, & cause of the denyer, in the eyes of all reasonable men.

Vppon which affirmation of myne his inference notwithstanding is of no force, viz. that *such ministers as give themselves to preaching do not in that buisnes exercise any power receaved from the prelate as a branch of him, because that power must then have been a naturall parte of his office.*

It followeth not. For as some partes, or workes of the parochiall ministers office are naturall, and necessary, as to read divine service &c. so are other workes or partes thereof but casuall, & arbytrary, as is this of preaching, as the person can, or will. It is not by any absolute necessity required of every minister to preach, but yet he that doth preach, doth it by authority of the prelate, in his parrish, as in a parte of the prelates province, or Diocesse. And where he speaks of *the ministers not exercising the power receaved from the prelate in that buisnes of preaching*, it is, as a poore shift, so a vayn insinuation, that though in other buisnesses he did exercise the prelates power, yet not in that of preaching. Whereas he both preacheth, & readeth divine service, & doth whatsoever he doth publicly, by one & the same ecclesiasticke power, & office. He is not one officer in the desk, & another in the pulpit, though his works be divers; but the Bps minister in both.

He ads (as apposite to an affirmation of myne, pag: 30.) that *though the prelacy were plucked up, yet the parochiall ministry might stand still, as reason (he sayth, but shewes none) will teach, and experience sheweth in Denmark, Saxony, Hesse, & other partes of Germany.*

But wherefore doth he lead me to Churches so far off, whose estate I neyther can easily know, nor he happily justify? Why doth he not rayther insist in the better both known, & reformed churches in the low countries? I perceave if I follow him in his *Manuductio* he will lead me copasse enough.

Well, I deny, & marvell he would affirm, that the same parochiall office, and power of ministry doth remayn in those Churches, which was



in use before the extirpation of the prelacy there. The office it self was the order of Masse-preisthood, & the power derived from the Pope, & popeish prelacy. That the works of preaching, and prayer, performed by many of the parochiall ministers, and also by some of the Masse-preists may remain, though the prelacy be taken away, (& with it the parochiall preisthood also) is without doubt; as they do in the reformed Churches, and with vs, where there is neyther prelate, nor parochiall minister: but our question is not about some particular workes, as myne opposite makes it, but (as hath been oft observed) about the very function it self, and the power by which it is given, and vsed.

And for the poynt: since all the ministers of that Church are made, & appoynted by the Bishops authority, take away the same Bishops authority; and how can the ministers remain the same ministers? Take away the correlative, and the relation ceaseth. 2. Take away the prelacy; and how possibly can such a ministry continue (as is the parochiall) whereof the one of the two partes (though the inferiour) which stands in *feeding the flock* by *ruling*, shalbe vsurped, and possessed by the prelates and theyr ordinaries. 3. Take away the Provin: and Dioc: Prelates, and with them the prov: and dioc: churches: and then the parochiall churches as partes of them must fall with them theyr whole: and with the churches the ministers, as partes of them. 4. It is not possible that the prelacy being abolished, such an office of ministry (of which office the reader must still remember our question to be) should survive, as whereof men vterly vnape to teach should be capable, as is with the parochiall ministry. Can such stufte passe thorough any but Byshopps fingers? or will the Lord ever wipe away so much of theyr shame as to suffer any other hands but of prelates, and theyr chaplayns to be layd vpon the heads of such Idoll-preists? Or is it possible that in any other then the Episcopall government the ministry of so many zealous, and learned teachers should hang vpon the copweb of conformity to Crosse, Surplice & such vanities, & be in daunger every day for refusall thereof to be broken asunder? Can this web be woven by others then Byshops, or of other stufte then comes out of theyr bowels? Lastly is it possible that in such light of the truth, as now shineth in Engl: all the profane parrish without difference should be compelled to be of the Church, & the minister of them to take charge, as his flock (as the parochiall ministers do): but as the same is a part of the Bishops flock, & well serving for to supporte his lawlesse Lordship? Now no man weighing these things with an equall hand will judge them light, and sleighty matters, but weighry, & as he speaks, *substantiall*, in & about the ministry. Which therefore cannot stand, as now it doth in the severall par-

riches, when God in mercy to that nation, shall *root out* that *plant* of the prelacy, which his hand never *planted*.

Where after to myne obiection, & charge, that all the parochiall ministers are subject unto the jurisdiction of the prelates spiritually, in their citations, suspensions, and excommunications, he for answer alledgeth, that *private Christians are subject to the same jurisdiction personally, & for personall & private opinions, and behaviours also*, it is that which I say, & vpon which I infer a separation from the formall state, & government. of that Church every manner of way, since with the sinns of Babylon (whereof I have proved in my former book the Hierarchicall government one) no man may partake. But if herevpon he would conclude the vnlawfulness of private or personall communion with the godly, as well as of publike, or Church communion, I must deny his consequence; & because I would not repeat the same things agayn, do desire the Reader to take knowledg of the double difference about this matter shewed in my former book.

pag: 10.  
Ans: to the  
3 obiection:

But he gives a 2d. answer, vpon which also the lawfulness of the Bishops authority is much pleaded, throughout the whole book. Which by the way, I desire the Reader to observe; & withall how such as go on in opposing, our separation, are driven in the end, to justify the Bishops authority; though diversly. His answer; & defence is.

*The greatest parts of their jurisdiction being exterrall & coactive or foreseeing, is from the king deerved unto those that do exercise the same: & therefore must of necessity be a civill power, such as the king might as well perform by other civill officers, as it is indubitably exercised in the high commission, & some other courts also. The lawes of the land do so esteem it; as Sir Edward Cook now L. chiefe Justice of Engl. hath largely shewed in the first book of his reportes.*

Divers pleas for the prelates have been made by men diversly minded touching them: but that their jurisdiction in their provinces & Diocesses should be civill, & coactive (for exterrall we graunt it to be, which is all joyned as the same with civill, & coactive, since even *\*spiritual* ordinances are exterrall also) this I say is a plea, which to my remembrance I never heard of before. The Authour in the front of his book proclaymes the *unreasonableness* of our separation: but I hope the Lord will give me grace, and modesty, never to defend, or continue in that state, & standing, for which I shal be driven, to make so unreasonable a defence: which is indeed an argument of an ill cause, & of no good consideration, that I say no more, in the writer.

\*1 Cor: 10.

For the better then, both clearing of this poynt here and els where in the book, & help of others other wise: it must be considered that the Bishops have in their hands a double authority the one civill as magistrates:

the

the other ſpiritually, as Church-officers: and ſo do perform workes of diuers kyndes according to theſe their diuers callings. By the former they ſit with other Barrons in the parliament-howſe for the enacting of lawes, & ſtatutes, vnder bodily puniſhments: ſome of them alſo being of the kings privy counsell, & ſome of his high commiſſion, haueing therein ioynt authority with other Lords, & Magiſtrates civil. They are generally, in the Countyes & Shyres where they live, Juſtices of peace, in the ſame Commiſſion with other honourable, & worſhipfull perſonages: & thus they ſit vpon the bench at Aſſiſes, & Sessions: & haue authority civil ioyntly with the other Juſtices; & ſo ſeverally as they, at other tymes, to apprehend, impriſon, fyne, & puniſh bodily, malefactours, according to the common lawes of the land, & theyr office of Juſticellſhip: and all theſe theyr adminiſtrations they perform expreſſy in the kings name. In which alſo they are to be honoured, & obeyed, as are other civil magiſtrates whatſoever, by all the kings ſubiects, & wherein, for my ſelf, I profeſſe communion with & ſubmiſſion vnto theyr authority, & power.

But beſydes this theyr civil authority they haue alſo eccleſiaſticall Iuriſdiction, as they are the Arch-Biſhops of Provinces, & Biſhops of Dioceſſes. And thus they with the reſt of theyr triumphant Church, & Clergy, ſit in the convocation houſe, fraueing Canons, & conſtitutions eccleſiaſticall, vnder ſpiritual penalties. Thus they ordeyn miniſters, & inſtitute them to theyr ſeveral charges; & give them licences to preach within theyr provinces, & Dioceſſes. Thus they keep theyr ſpiritual courts by themſelves, & theyr ſubordinates, Chancelours, Commiſſaries, Arch-Deacons, & other theyr officials: citing men thither by theyr Apparitours; as on the contrary in theyr civil adminiſtrations. (though in matters eccleſiaſticall) they uſe Purſuivants, & Conſtables. There; and thus they ſuſpend, depoſe, & degrade miniſters: as at the firſt they ordeyned, and appoynted them: as they alſo excommunicate, & abſolve both miniſters, and people as they ſee cauſe: proceeding in all theſe, not in the name of the king, as in the former, but expreſſy in the name of God: in & vnto which theyr uſurpation of the name or power of God, & Chriſt; no communion may be had, or ſubmiſſion yealded.

And where he affirmeth that the greateſt parte of theyr Iuriſdiction (ſo wit in theyr Provinces, & Dioceſſes) is deriued from the king, which he might, as well perform by other ciuile officers, & that the lawes of the land do ſo eſteem it, alledging to that end S. Edwards booke of the Iuſtice, there is a great miſtakeing in the matter. Not onely the greateſt parte of, but in effect, theyr whole Iuriſdiction in theyr provinces, & dioceſſes, ſtandes, in theyr ordeyning of miniſters & excommunicating of offenders with theyr apurtenances, & in

John, 16. 39

in their contraries, of the same nature? Now to make the power of excommunication & of ordination of ministers civile, or these such works as may be performed by civile magistrates, the king, or others, is to confound heaven, & earth; & to make (*Christ's kingdom*) whereof these works, in their nature, are administrations) to be of *this world*. This power of the prelates is in it self, & nature, spirituall: & in the extent of it over an whole Province & Diocese, & all the Congregations therein (to the abolishing of the power both of officers & people) papall, & antichristian, Of which the kinges civile authority is no parent, but onely a nurse; otherwise the king should be not the *defender* onely, but the author of the *Churches* in her government, & ministry. Papists have made of Popes kings, by deriveing from them civile governments: and will protestants make of kings, Popes, by deriving spirituall authority from them? And because Popish kings have given their power to the beast, shall Christian kings therefore take the beasts power vnto them: which they should surely do in making themselves the spring-heades from whence floweth the power of making ministers, & excommunicateing offenders which the Prelates vse in their Provinces, & Diocesses?

And albeit for want of the bookes I cannot exactly set down the judgment of the lawes in this case, yet may I safely affirm, that they no where derive from the kinges civile authority, the power of these spirituall administrations, but do onely make the king the establisher, & vpholder civility of this power. The same ecclesiasticall jurisdiction which had been in vse in popery, & a great part of the popish Hierarchy, was confirmed *Elizabeth*: & so continueth at this day: & in vayne men apply theyr industry & art in the washing of this blackmore. Neyther yet doth it follow, though the lawes of the land did esteem this Jurisdiction civile, that therefore it were such indeed. They may, and do misseem many things, especially, of this kynde. They esteem the Crosse, Surplice, &c. indifferent, yea comely, & edificative ceremonyes: & are they therefore such, or so esteemed by this author? So for those *corrupt usurpations, & abuses*, which he affirmeth to be mingled with the Bishops (so seeming vnto him) civile power, do not the lawes of the land esteem even them also lawfull, & laudable ordinances, & orders? The Arguments therefore from the lawes esteem to the nature of the thing is of no force.

Now where the prelates jurisdiction in their Prov: & Dioc: is not civile, but ecclesiasticall, & a spiritual externall power, appeareth playnly by these Reasons:

First where he makes it *civil*, because it is *coactive*, or bodily enforcing, I conclude on the contrary, that because it is not so coactive, therefore it



is not civile. The furthest the Byshops can go, as Byshops, is to excommunicate a man, or to pronounce him an heretique: which done they may deliver him to the secular power, or procure a civile coactive † proccesse against him from the L: Chauncelour, in certayn cases. † De exc6. municato capiendo.

2<sup>dly</sup>. Where he affirmeth that the king might perform the works of theyr iurisdiction by other civile officers, there neyther can be stronger, nor need be other Arguments to prove the contrary, then the very consideration of the nature of those theyr workes: which are for substance, the making of ministers, & excommunicateing of offenders with theyr contraryes, & appurtenances: which to call civile workes, what is it but to make a civile religion?

3<sup>dly</sup>. Let theyr consecration to theyr byshopricks be looked into, and there wilbe found in them no word, or fillable insinuateing any civile authority; but onely that which is spirituall, for the *feeding of the flock*, & *doing the work*, *whereunto the H: Ghost hath called them*: such scriptures also being therevnto applyed, as conteyn in them onely the callings, offices, & workes of the ministers of the Church.

III.  
Consecra-  
tion of By-  
shops.

4<sup>th</sup>. Theyr civile authority, whether that which is peculiar to some of them, as to be of the pryvy counsell, or high commission; or that which is more ordinary, & comon to all, as to be Iusticers of peace in the countreyes where they live, is but one, & the same, & conveyed by one, and the same ioynt calling, & commission with that of other counsaylers, commissioners, & Iusticers: & therefore is nothing at all to that iurisdiction by which they ordeyn ministers, and excommunicate offenders, which the foresayd civile magistrates neyther have nor can have power to practise: though (by theyr civile power) they do, and may (civilely) restreyn men vnder peyn of bodily punishmēt. Ad vnto this also, that the Byshops may, & do exercise all, & every part of theyr episcopall authority, where they have not the least civile authority, viz: in the cityes and corporations within theyr Provinces and Diocesses: as for example, the Bishop of Norwich in the city of Norwich, where his civile authority is no more then myne.

III.

Lastly whereas all civile proceedings are made in the name of the king; they on the contrary side proceed *in the name of God*, though too oft verifing the old saying, *in nomine Dei incipit omne malum*.

V.

And by these reasons that which I did not suspect that any would have denied, is confirmed, to wit, that the Prelates power in theyr Provinces, and Diocesses, is not civile, but a kynde of externall spirituall power which I have also in my former book proved Antichristian, as vsurpeing vpon Christs royal prerogatives, subverting the order of true Christian govern-  
C  
ment,

ment, & swallowing vp, as with full mouth, both the peoples liberty, and Elders government, wherewith Christ the Lord hath invested the true Church.

He proceedeth. *But if this be so, then (sayth Mr Rob:) those ministers are binder no spirituall government: and so be lawlesse persons, and inordinate walkers &c.*

His answers are. 1. that they so govern themselves, as that no honest man hath cause to abhor from theyr communion. 2. that they are subiect to ciuile government, even in spirituall actions: & in the larger acceptation of the word in externall regiment merely spirituall. 3. that they are no more lawlesse persons, then I my self was when I had no elder ioynd with me, or am now with my ne one Elder, since I exclude the people from all government.

In these answers he neyther dealeth with me, nor the cause of the Lord, as is meet. For first, I do not in my book infer this exception vpon the former ground, as he sets it down for his advantage, as will appear in the examination of the 3. answer. 2. I do not alledge it to prove communion vnlawfull with them, as he insinuates, but to reprove, & that vpon theyr own plea, theyr Church-state, & standing, as such, as wherein they neyther do nor can enjoy the spirituall externall government of Christ in his Church: & so neyther have that conscience, which is meet of the commandments of Christ by his Apostles, to geue due honour to them who rule well: & to submit themselves to those who are over them in the Lord: nor of theyr own fraylties, & in what need they stand of the Lords ordinances, & of this in speciall, for theyr guidance, & conservation in his wayes.

And though he passe by this reproof, not myne, but the H: Ghostes, turning it off another way, yet let the godly Reader with good conscience remember that the disciples of Christ are to observe whatsoever he hath commanded his Apostles: & withall that it was the Prophets comfort, that he should not be confounded, when he had respect to all Gods commandments: 3. In his 1. & 2. answer he speakes not at all to the purpose in hand: our question not being about the personall government, which a man hath over himself; nor about ciuile government, though in spirituall actions, nor about government at all, in the larger acceptation of the word: but onely as it is taken for the outward guidance & ordering of the Church in her publike affairs, by the Bishops, or Elders. And thus, and in this regarde all in the parrish assemblies (if not vnder the Prelates spirituall iurisdiction, as many would awake themselves, and others beleeve) are lawlesse persons, & inordinate walkers: neyther is this myne assertion cyther lawlesse, or lawlesse, but a just & necessary testimony agaynst theyr transgression: of which I wish them from the Lord more conscience, & for that purpose, better counsaile, then in this *manumission* they finde. Lastly, to make way to a touch of wit, vnto which

1 Tim. 5. 17  
Heb 13 17.

Mat. 23. 20.  
Deut. 4. 1.  
& 6. 1. 2.  
Psal: 119. 8

he cannot get by my wordes, & meaning truly related, he takes liberty to change the one & other, for his advantage. I do p: 30 propound *undry defences made by such* both ministers, & people, *as dislike the prelacy:* and the first, of the people, to wit, that they are *not sub. & to the prelates government.* And that I intend this of the people, is evident by my reply in the same place: the words whereof I have formerly noted down in the 2<sup>d</sup> consideration of his answer. This by me spoken, and intended of the people, he misapplyeth to the ministers, putting, as my wordes, *These ministers are under no spirituall government:* and so would (in wantonnesse of wit) fasten the same reproof vpon my self as haueing been formerly with none, & now with one Elder, without government also, and so an *inordinate walker.*

The truth then is, that the people professing themselves (though most vntreuly) to be from vnder the Prelates Spirituall government, do therein professe themselves to be from vnder all christian church government: & that, both ministers, and people professing themselves to be from vnder the prelates spirituall power, do therein professe themselves to be from vnder all power of Christ for the censures; & in those respects, and considerations (of which onely I speak though he stretch my words further then he should eyther in charity or equity) to be *lawlesse persons & inordinate walkers,* & without the yoke of Christ, & one speciall means of their salvation.

1. Cor. 5. 4.  
5.

And thus much for the confirmation of my testimony agaynst communion with the parochiall assembles, in the particulars (though far fro all in my former book, as myne opposite pretendeth) wherein he hath endeavoured to weaken it: where I also desyre the Reader well to note, that whatsoever eyther he pretendeth, or others conceave of publique communion following vppon private, yet the issue unto which things come between him & me is in these two questions. 1. whether the Bishops jurisdiction in theyr provinces, & diocesses be lawfull, or no? 2. whether the parochiall ministers being ordeyned, instituted, & licensed by the Bishops, do preach by theyr authority, or no?

1 Cor. 5. 4. 5

*The other two stumbling blockes (as he calls them) viz. that all are urged to communion by pœnall lawes; & that a set forme of prayer is appointed,* he neyther purposeth, nor thinks it needfull to deal about, *saying 1. there are many exercises of religion where none are present by constraynt, nor the service book so much as appeareth:* for which he instanceth in *Mr. Parkers his exercise.*

And wherefore doth he still after his (but an evill) custome chaunge the state of the question? which is not about mens being present by constraynt at the exercises of religion, but about Churches gathered by constraynt of all the profane parishioners with the other handfull; as was that parish

church whereof Mr Perkins was a member, & where he taught: & that by authority from & vnder the prelates.

My being once at his successours sermon since I professed separation, is neyther pertinently, nor truly objected by him. I was there as in many other places since I made question of it, & disputed for it, but had not otherwise professed it. And vppō this occasion I think good to note down the work of Gods provideace towards me in this matter. Coming to Cambridge (as to other places where I hoped most to fynde satisfaccion to my troubled heart) I went the fore-noon to Mr Cha: his exercise: who vpon the relation which Mary made to the disciples of the resurrection of Christ, delivered, in effect, this doctrine; that the things which concerned the whole church were to be declared publicly to the whole Church, & not to some parte onely: bringing for instance, & prooffe the wordes of Christ, Mat: 18 17. Tell it to the Church: confirming therein one mayn ground of our difference from the Ch: of Engl: which is that Christ hath given his power for excommunication to the whole church gathered together in his name as 1 Cor: 5: the officers as the governors, & the people as the governed in the v<sup>e</sup> thereof; vnto which Church his servants are comaunded to bring theyr necessary complaynts. And I would desyre myne opposite eyther to shew me how, & where this Church is, having this power, in the parish assemblies: or els by what warrant of Gods word I (knowing what Christ the Lord comaunded herein) may with good conscience remayn a member of a Ch: without this power (much lesse where the contrary is advanced) & so go on in the known transgression of that his comaundement, Tell the church?

In the afternoon I went to hear Mr B: the successour of Mr. Perkins, who from Eph: 5. & v: 7. or 11. shewed the vnlawfulness of familiar conversation between the servants of God, & the wicked, vpon these grounds, or the most of them. 1. that the former are light, & the other darknes, between which God hath separated. 2. that the godly hereby are endaugered to be leavened with the others wickednes. 3. that the wicked are hereby hardened in receaving such approbation from the godly. 4. that others are thereby offended, & occasioned to think them all alike, & as birds of a feather, which so flock together. Whom afterwarde privately I desyred, as I do also others, to consider, vvether these very Reasons make not as effectually & much more agaynst the spirituall communion of Gods people, (especially vvhere there wants the means of reformatiō) vvith the apparently vvicked, to vvhom they are as light to darknes.

To that vvhich he alledged in the 2<sup>d</sup> place of the reformed Churches generally vsing a stint form of prayer, with whom yet I will not refuse all publique communion, I answer, that for the very v<sup>e</sup> of a set form of prayer, or other the like

Math. 18.

Mark. 16.



like sayling I will not refuse communion with a true Church in things lawfull: but between the set form of prayer vsed in the reformed Churches, & in the vnreformed Ch: of Engl: I put great difference; not onely in the matter, & sundry orders thereof, but especially in the manner of imposing it: which in the reformed Ch: is not by compulsion, nor in the first place, as in the Ch: of Engl: where the reading of it is preferred before, & above the preaching of the gospell: and where more ministers (and those of the best sorte) have been deprived of theyr ministry in a few monthes for the not reading, and obseruing it in manner, & form, then have been ever since the Pope was expelled, not onely for not preaching (for which no man is so censured) but for all other wickednes of what kynde soever, though abounding in the ministry there. By which, that theyr set service is *advanced above all that is called God*, & made a very hatefull Idol, to which both great & small are compelled to bow down, & it to honour. Which Idol-service also vpholdeth an Idol-ministry: which, as it is truly so called, would without it be vvell nigh as dumb, as the *Idols of the heathens, which* Psal. 115.  
*have mouthes, & speak not.* 5.

For conclusion, he affirmeth, that *by the lawes of Geneva like strictnes*, (to wit, vnto that in Engl:) *is vsed towards the inhabitants of that city, though I vnadvisably deny it in myne assertion of the Engl: assemblies difference therein from all true Churches in the world.* pag: 20.

In that place of my book I observ two mayn differences between the Churches of Christ, as the scriptures testify of them; and the parish assemblies in their very constitution. With these differences thus propounded he medleth not, eyther by shewing how the assemblies agree therein with the Apostolical Churches, or how disagreeing from them in the one, and other, they can be true visible Churches rightly gathered & constituted. But where by the way for amplification I mention the reformed Churches, as intersted in the same differences frō Engl: he there steps in and takes me *by the hand*, and *leads me along to Geneva*: as belike rayther hoping to make the Church of Engl: agree in some thing with the lawes of Geneva, then with the lawes of Christs testament. But was the Church of Geneva indeed gathered of all the apparently wicked, and flagitious persons in the city, amongst the rest, scarce sensible in so vast a heap, as were, and are the English parrotchial assemblies? If the state of Geneva did in a politique respect expell out of the citie such the inhabirants, as were not well affected towards the religion, and that the Church were gathered of the rest, being judged in charity capable of the holy things of God, upon their personall confession; how then standeth this agreement between the Genevean, and Engl: assemblies? And if the Church of Gen: had been

gathered after popery ( as the Engl: assemblies were, and: it was not ) of all the unhallowed rowt in the city, without separation, I should confess: myne *unadvisednes* in my better judgement of it, then it deserved.

And thus much for this letter, which the Authour might more fitly have called *an exercise of wit*, then a *Manumission*, as he doth. And for that it is in effect intended for the justification of the Ministerie, it shall not be amisse for the better help of the Reader, and fartherance of the truth, breisly to set down such particulars, as by the scriptures and good reason thereunto agreeable, are of absolute necessitie for a true ordinary Church-officer, and minister of Christ; which for order sake I will reduce to four heads.

The first is; that there be a true visible Church, in which he is to be appointed \* *God having set in the Church, Apostles, Prophets, Teachers etc: & mention being made every where of the "making and ordyning of Elders, or Bishops in the Churches". Whereupon 1. I desire to know how the ministers of the Church of England can be true Ministers, not being made, and ordeyned such in and to any particular Church? 2. Since, as is rightly acknowledged in the former part of the book, Every true visible Church is a company of people called and separated out of the world, I would know how many, and which of the parrish Churches consist of such a separated people, and are not both (at the best) in their persons mixt of the people of God, and the world, and also mixt in one nationall, provincially, and diocesan Church, or body with all the godles multitude, and part of the world in that land? 3. I ad, that since a separated people from the world is but the matter of the Church, and that for a true Church a true form is also required, it must also be shewed how that can be found there. This form cannot be any particular act, which is transeunt, and passeth away, but something constant, and permanent, without which resydeing actually in the whole and all the partes thereof, the Church cannot consist one moment; neyther yet can it be any personall thing eyther disposition, or other relation whatsover: nor other, as I conceav, then a publique orderly covenant, and union of a particular assembly, by which it hath in it self entyre right to Christ, and to all the meanes of enjoying him: which I rayther with could be, the beleefe can be (for the present) found in any parrish Church in the land. Lastly, if the Provincially, and Diocesan Churches be not true visible Churches ( which I suppose is this Authours judgment ) I would know how the parrish assemblies being partes of the other, and so partes of false Churches, can any more be reputed true Churches, then could a particular Iewish Synagogue be reputed a true Church, which should have made it self an entyre, and independent body in respect of the nationall Church, and Temple?*

But

\* 1. Cor. 12.

28.

"Act. 14. 23

& 20. 17. 28

1 Tim. 5. 1.

Tit. 1. 5.

But now if any of the parrish assemblies be thus separated in theyr personall, & church estate, and formed accordingly (though with defects, & wants) we desire to take knowledg of them, and which they be, that we may rejoyce for the grace of God towards them, and perform vnto them the duties of Christian fellowship, as is meet.

The 2<sup>d</sup> necessary for a true ministry is a fit person, in whom *apnes to teach, & unreprouablenes* in conversation is found: even reason teaching that whomsoever God calleth to any estate he fitteth cōperently for the mayn works thereof. In whom also for his own comfort with God, is required an inward calling, which with Calvin I conceav to be an holy disposition, & desire to administer the gospell of Christ to the glory of God, and furtherance of mans saluation. Which inward calling as a true minister before men may want, as did Iudas, so for that they in Engl: much pretend it whē they cānot justify their outward, I demaund whether a man thus inwardly called of God, & foresitted accordingly, & being with all perswaded in his heart that a lawfull outward calling, & without sin in the enterance, & continuance, cannot be had in the Ch: of Engl: whether, I say, such a mā be not bound in conscience to seek out, or procure another Church then the Church of Engl: in the present state thereof; by, & vnto which he may lawfully enter, & administer: & how otherwise he doth not cyther carelesly neglect, or sinfully profane the Lordes inward calling in his heart?

The 3<sup>d</sup> thing necessary is a true, & lawfull office, or function of ministry; there being, as the Apostle teacheth, *diuersities of administrations, but (& by) the same Lord*, even the L: Iesus: who when he ascended on high gave gifts vnto men, some Apostles, & some Prophets, & some Euāgelists & some Pastours, & Teachers. Now this office, & order not being a matter of dignity, as the order of knighthood, or the like, but of work & service; & this worke standing summarily in *feeding the flock*, Aēt. 20. 28. and this feeding, in *teaching & ruling*, as the two mayn partes thereof, I demaund how that can possibly be the true, & lawfull function, or office of a Byshop or Pastour, vnto vvhich preaching to the flock is not necessarily required, nor ruling so much as permitted; as vve all knowv the case standeth with the English ministry?

Lastly there is required a true & lawfull outvvard calling of the ministers by those in vvhom the Lord hath left that right, & pōwer: vvhich (if the scriptures may bear sway) are the particular congregations in, and vnto vvhich they are to administer. And of such force is this true & lawfull outvvard calling, as that by it, & none otherwise, this fit, and lawfull person becomes properly, & immediately, a true pastour. And how then can he be a true pastour, vvhose calling vnto his function, or office of preisthood

in

II.

1 Tim: 3.

III.

1 Cor: 12. 5

Eph: 4. 8.

11. 12. 13.

1 Tim: 3. 2.

1 Tim 5. 17

III.

Heb: 5. 4. 5

Aēt. 1. &amp; 6

&amp; 14. &amp;

1 Tim: 3.

## A Manumission

in the Ch: of Eng: is merely by the prelate of the province, or Diocesse; by whose licence or institution he is also aftervvards designed to his more particular charge ?

These 4 conditio<sup>n</sup>s & every of them are necessarily requyred to the constitution of a true pastour: & are none of them (to my knowvledg) save the 2<sup>d</sup> to be found in the parochiall ministry. Let myne opposite eyther disprove the former, or manifest the latter, & howv, & vvhere such a ministry is to be found? but let him do it in that godly simplicity, vvhich becommeth the gospel, and the things thereof: prescribing to himself

vvith due reverence of God in vvhose vvorke he dealeth, the sacred bounds of the Apostle saying, *we can do nothing a-*

*gaynst the truth, but for the truth.* In. & into

vvhich the God thereof guide both

him, and my selfe, and

all his alvvayes.

Amen.

